

Remarks

The Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of the rejection based on Ono.

The Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3, 9-11 and 18 to recite that the precursor of the flame-resistant polymer is an acrylonitrile polymer which is denatured with an amine compound and made flame resistant with an oxidizing agent. Support may be found throughout the Applicants' Specification such as in paragraph [0053] on page 23. Entry into the official file is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Chiang. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments with respect to individual ones of the claims and their relationship to Chiang. The Applicants also note in paragraph 6 of the Official Action that the rejection acknowledged the Applicants' arguments that Chiang fails to show certain features as argued by the Applicants, i.e., "the acrylonitrile polymer may be a precursor of the flame-resistant polymer," but were not cited in the rejected claims. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the previously amended claims specifically recite that the precursor of the flame-resistant polymer is an acrylonitrile polymer. Thus, the Applicants request clarification and allowance of Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 based on Chiang.

The Applicants respectfully submit, in any event, that Chiang fails to teach the Applicants utilization of an oxidizing agent which facilitates increased flame resistance. Careful scrutiny of the entire Chiang disclosure revealed that there is no discussion of such an oxidizing agent. Instead, Chiang is directed to modified polyacrylonitriles that were obtained with primary amines and without catalysts in DMSO as a solvent. Cross-linking is achieved through heat treatment. However, there is no disclosure concerning the Applicants' claimed oxidizing agent

which facilitates an increase in flame retardance. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 18-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Gump. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comments hypothetically applying Gump to those claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that Gump fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter. Details are set forth below.

Gump discloses in its simplest form the utilization of a solution containing acrylic polymer, an organic antioxidant and a solvent for the acrylic polymer and the organic antioxidant. The Applicants respectfully submit that the antioxidant of Gump is not employed by the Applicants. In sharp contrast, the Applicants employ an oxidizing agent. In other words, the Applicants use the opposite component of that employed by Gump.

Thus, not only do the Applicants use a constitutional element that is not the same or similar to that employed by Gump, but they use a constitutional element that is exactly the opposite of that employed by Gump. The Applicants respectfully submit that such a radically different constitutional element causes Gump to be inapplicable under §102. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/cs
(215) 656-3381